1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO
3	JAMIN BAILON and ROMIE ADAMS, as Personal Representative of
4	the WRONGFUL DEATH ESTATE OF JOHN THADDEUS BAILON, and
5	Next Friend of A.B., a Minor Child,
6	Plaintiffs,
7	vs. CV-20-00230 LF/CG
8	VALENCIA COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS and JOSEPH
9	ROWLAND and JUAN RODRIGUEZ, in both their individual and their official capacities,
11	Defendants.
12	
13	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
14	FAIRNESS HEARING (VIA ZOOM) BEFORE THE HONORABLE LAURA FASHING
15	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 26, 2020, 2:00 P.M. ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO
16	MIDOQUINQUI, NEW HEATCO
17	
18	FOR THE PLAINTIFFS:
19	LAW OFFICE OF PHILIP B. DAVIS Attorneys at Law
20	1000 Lomas Boulevard, Northwest Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102
21	BY: MR. PHILIP B. DAVIS
22	AND
23	CHAVEZ LAW FIRM, PC Attorneys at Law
24	10 Peralta Farms Court Peralta, New Mexico 87042
25	BY: MR. STEVEN MARK CHAVEZ

JULIE GOEHL, RDR, CRR, RPR, RMR, NM CCR #95
FEDERAL OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER
333 Lomas Boulevard, Northwest
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102

1	FOR THE DEFENDANTS:
2	LAW OFFICE OF JONLYN M. MARTINEZ, LLC Attorneys at Law
3	Post Office Box 1805 Albuquerque, New Mexico 87103
4	BY: MS. JONLYN M. MARTINEZ
5	
6	ALSO PRESENT: MS. ROMIE ADAMS, Personal Representative
7	
8	Proceedings reported by machine shorthand, and
9	transcript produced by computer-aided transcription.
10	
11	Reported by:
12	JULIE GOEHL, RDR, CRR, RPR, RMR, NM CCR #95 United States Court Reporter
13 14	333 Lomas Boulevard, Northwest Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102 Phone: (505)348-2209
15	Email: Julie_Goehl@nmd.uscourts.gov
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	FAIRNESS HEARING (VIA ZOOM)
2	(Court in session at 2:00 p.m.)
3	THE COURT: Good afternoon, everybody.
4	We are here this afternoon for a fairness
5	hearing in the case of it's J-A-M-I-N, Jamin. How do
6	you say that, Mr. Davis?
7	MR. PHILIP DAVIS: Jamin Bailon, Your Honor.
8	THE COURT: Jamin Bailon and Romie Adams, as
9	Personal Representative of the Wrongful Death Estate of
10	John Thaddeus Bailon, and Next Friend of A.B., a Minor
11	Child v. Valencia County Board of County Commissioners
12	and Joseph Rowland and Juan Rodriguez, in both their
13	individual and their official capacities.
14	May I have appearances, please?
15	MR. PHILIP DAVIS: Yes, Your Honor. Philip
16	Davis for the plaintiffs.
17	MR. STEVEN CHAVEZ: Steven Chavez, Your Honor,
18	for the plaintiffs.
19	MS. ROMIE ADAMS: Romie Adams, personal
20	representative.
21	MS. JONLYN MARTINEZ: Jonlyn Martinez on
22	behalf of the defendants, Your Honor.
23	THE COURT: Okay. And we are using a court
24	reporter. Let me ask, Ms. Goehl, if you can hear not
25	if you can hear, but do you need this recorded in

addition to your own procedure? Do you want me to record it on Zoom?

2.4

THE COURT REPORTER: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. She has indicated "No," although she was on mute. I think she indicated "No," so we will just go ahead with this hearing just using the systems of the court reporter. She may be recording it also for her own purposes.

All right. So it is a fairness hearing. At a fairness hearing, the question, of course, is essentially whether the proposed settlement is in the best interests of the minor child, who in this case is A.B.

My first question to the parties is whether we need to seal any portion of this hearing? And let me start with you, Mr. Davis. My intent is to continue to refer to the child as "A.B." But, Mr. Davis, do you see any reason to seal the hearing?

MR. PHILIP DAVIS: I don't, Your Honor. The minor child is 17, she turns 18 in February, and I don't see the need to seal it. And quite frankly, if you are more comfortable using her initials, we can, but I'm not opposed to using her name.

THE COURT: Okay. I suppose I prefer using her initials because under our court filing rules, if

anything involves a minor, it needs to be -- for 1 2 example, if we had a transcript prepared of this at any 3 time, then we'd have to go through the transcript, and any time we referred to her actual name, we'd have to 4 change it to "A.B." So I think it's just easier if we 5 6 refer to her by her initials. 7 MR. PHILIP DAVIS: That's fine, Your Honor. 8 We are happy to do that. 9 THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Martinez, do you agree 10 there's no reason to seal any portion of this hearing? 11 MS. JONLYN MARTINEZ: I do agree, Your Honor. 12 THE COURT: Okay. So then also, of course, 13 with respect to whether or not this proposed settlement 14 is in the best interests of the child, I need to 15 consider four different factors: 16 Whether the proposed settlement was 17 fairly and honestly negotiated. 18 Two. Whether serious questions of law and 19 fact exist placing the ultimate outcome of the 20 litigation in doubt. Three. Whether the value of an immediate 21 22 recovery outweighs the mere possibility of future relief 23 after protracted and expensive litigation. 2.4 Four. Whether in the judgment of the parties,

JULIE GOEHL, RDR, CRR, RPR, RMR, NM CCR #95
FEDERAL OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER
333 Lomas Boulevard, Northwest
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102

that the settlement is fair and reasonable.

25

2.4

weigh in on those issues. I think I will start with you, Mr. Davis, or actually, Mr. Chavez. I don't know who prefers to proceed. Whoever wants to speak for the plaintiff, if you could first tell me the basic terms of the settlement agreement, and then go on to address some of those other issues; how it was negotiated; serious questions of law and fact; value of an immediate recovery over possibility of future relief; and whether, in your view, the settlement is fair and reasonable.

So, again, whoever wishes to speak for the plaintiffs, Mr. Davis or Mr. Chavez?

MR. PHILIP DAVIS: Yes, Your Honor. It's Phil Davis, and I'll do that.

I believe that the proposed settlement is fair and reasonable to the minor. I think it was fairly and honestly negotiated. The case settled for \$125,000 inclusive of damages, fees, costs, applicable gross receipts tax. This case was mediated several months ago, and the defendants did not offer a lot of money. The settlement mediation conference was actually extremely short. I don't think it lasted an hour. I thought that the most profound comment that we got from the mediator in that was, "Well, you'll get to a jury; and boy, are you in trouble once you get there."

2.4

And he was absolutely right; and, in fact, he wasn't telling us anything that we didn't already know. This is a wrongful death shooting case that started in State Court under state law. We discovered it, and we established in our own minds a good faith basis to amend the complaint, bring a 1983 action upon which Ms.

Martinez promptly removed, which we expected her to do. So we were faced, obviously, with qualified immunity in regard to the use of deadly force under the Fourth Amendment.

The other big picture issue for us -- well, there were two, one on liability and one on damages. Liability. The officers were deposed, and they told a story that seemed coherent and seemed compelling and was absolutely in contradiction to what our expert witnesses told us the evidence established as a matter of ballistics, blood spatter, and accident reconstruction, which meant that we were faced with the prospect of persuading a jury that the officers were lying about what happened.

And we also were faced with the prospect of having a jury believe a bunch of experts instead of real honest to goodness walking, talking police officers.

And I've been around enough to know that was an uphill battle from the start. Even if my experts spoke matters

2.4

that were truthful and compelling, the officers' story just didn't square with it.

There was only one eyewitness to the shooting other than the two officers who were present at the scene and who fired their weapons at the decedent. That eyewitness was a woman who was in the mobile home adjacent to the yard where the decedent was in a car, trying to flee, when he was shot to death by the officers. The eyewitness initially told investigating officers at the scene that she had seen nothing, and she later confided to Mr. Chavez's investigator that she told them that because, one, she distrusted police officers; and two, that she was fearful of retaliation if she told the officers a story that they did not want to hear, which was that there was no reason for them to have shot Mr. Bailon to death.

So here we are, faced with an investigation that tells us that the eyewitness said, "I saw nothing," and then she tells us a story that actually corroborates what our experts are telling us. Well, that sounds like good news right up until the moment that Ms. Martinez notices up our eyewitness for deposition. And Ms. Martinez is a skillful, experienced, relentless examiner, and the upshot was that the eyewitness simply lost it and exploded in a vulgar verbally abusive

2.4

torrent of epithets against Ms. Martinez, after which she got up and walked out, which basically left us with no eyewitness because it became impossible at that point, in our judgment, to put her on the stand.

That was the problem with liability.

The comparative fault under state law was obvious because of the story in regard to how this man had endangered the officers' lives. And I don't need to explain to you why qualified immunity is always a problem in a deadly force case.

On damages in the case, in particular the decedent had spent most of his life in prison; had no earnings history; had no real particular connection to his family, including his two children, and had limited contact with them in the several months before he was shot to death. And then Ms. Martinez unearthed from the Department of Corrections a series of literally hundreds of tape-recorded phone calls that the decedent had made while he was incarcerated, and one was worse than the next in terms of statements that the decedent made in regard to his relationship with his children, among other things, which essentially trashed our loss of consortium claims and left us with a case that was highly risky on liability and highly risky on damages. Based on that, the defendants did not rely very much to

mediation.

2.4

Afterward, Ms. Martinez and I began a fairly frank conversation about what it would take to get the case settled. We made offers back and forth. Let me qualify that. We made an offer, and it was rejected. We made another offer, and it was rejected. And then we made a third offer that Ms. Martinez persuaded the Association of Counties to accept, and that was the 125.

So I think that the case was fairly and honestly negotiated. I think that there are serious questions of law and fact that left us with a case that might have had a good result, but almost more certainly would have had a bad result.

The value now versus the future relief, in light of the difficulty of proving damages, is quite frankly a no-brainer for us. And as a result, even though the two children are not getting very much money out of this settlement, it's fair and reasonable.

The costs for us were enormous. Mr. Chavez and I booked over \$150,000 in attorneys' fees, and together we are accepting fees out of the settlement of about \$40,000, which is about 25 cents on the dollar, based on our hourly rates.

What we did was, we took the \$125,000. There was \$7500 in my trust account left over from an IPRA

2.4

case that we had prevailed on against the Department of Public Safety, and we added those together to get \$132,500. We subtracted \$50,000 for costs, and that did not include about \$10,000 in costs that Mr. Chavez and I wrote off.

So after \$50,000 in costs getting reimbursed, that leaves \$82,500, and what we decided to do was simply split it four ways: One quarter to Jamin Bailon; one quarter to A.B.; and then a quarter each to Mr. Chavez and me. So the number is approximately \$20,625 that each of us is getting out of the settlement.

Ms. Adams also agreed to reduce her personal representative fees substantially in order to enable us to get this case settled. I have worked with Ms. Adams before in wrongful death cases as the personal representative, and I know that the fee that she agreed to take in this case is substantially less than what she would have expected in the normal case.

So for all those reasons, I think that there is clearly a record to satisfy the Court that it can approve this settlement as being in the best interests of the minor.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Davis. I have a couple of questions. With respect to the qualified immunity defense, what was the allegation

2.4

there? Was it that the officers were in fear for their lives when he started to flee in his automobile?

MR. PHILIP DAVIS: Yes. What the officers did was, one of the officers testified —— the sergeant testified that the car started to go backwards; that the driver's door was open; that he was actually inside the open driver's door; and as the car started to go backwards, he feared that he would be pulled under the car because he was caught in the door. Our ballistics established that his story of being inside the door was not right, but that was the allegation that was the justifiable homicide defense, was fear for harm to himself. And then the other officer testified that he saw his sergeant was in danger and he fired shots in order to protect the life of his sergeant.

THE COURT: Okay. And was it the other officer who was the shooter, or did they both shoot?

MR. PHILIP DAVIS: They both shot.

THE COURT: Okay. And then just -- and this may be a stupid question, so I'll just put it in that category, but just for my own edification, I'm always a little confused. Does there always seem to be a personal representative in a wrongful death estate? And is there a requirement that that be a particular -- I mean, is there any qualification for that role?

2.4

MR. PHILIP DAVIS: The answer to your first question is "Yes." State law requires a personal representative be appointed in order to bring the cause of action on behalf of the estate.

And the answer to your second question is that the qualification is that the personal representative agrees to accept the appointment and act consistent with state law. And the role of the personal representative under state law is essentially to ensure that the settlement monies, if recovered, are properly distributed among the beneficiaries of the estate.

THE COURT: Which may be different than, for example, if the person had a will?

MR. PHILIP DAVIS: No, Your Honor. And I'm treading lightly on areas that I'm not terribly familiar with, and Mr. Chavez may be able to do a better job, but the res that is the cause of action that belongs to the estate of a decedent who alleges a wrongful death doesn't pass through a will, and so the beneficiaries are based on state law in regard to who the survivors are of the decedent.

THE COURT: Yes, I suppose that's what I meant, was that the beneficiaries are beneficiaries that are identified just by law, and not necessarily beneficiaries of somebody's estate if they have a will?

```
MR. PHILIP DAVIS: That is correct, Your
 1
 2
        Honor.
 3
                  THE COURT:
                             Okay.
                  MR. STEVEN CHAVEZ: Fiduciary duties, Your
 4
 5
        Honor, are basically the same in state law as in
 6
        wrongful death law.
 7
                  THE COURT: Okay. And does the personal
        representative owe a fiduciary duty towards the
 8
 9
        beneficiaries at all?
10
                  MR. PHILIP DAVIS: Yes. The fiduciary duty is
11
        to ensure that the beneficiaries properly receive the
12
        distributions to which they are entitled from the estate
13
        of the decedent in the wrongful death action.
14
                  THE COURT: Is there any requirement that she,
15
        in this case, act in the best interests of the
16
        beneficiaries in, for example, negotiating a settlement?
17
                  MR. PHILIP DAVIS: I think that that's part of
18
       her fiduciary duty. I think that she would not -- well,
19
        let me try it this way. The personal representative
        ultimately is the real party in interest who consents to
2.0
21
        the settlement; and in so doing, she has a fiduciary
22
        obligation to the beneficiaries to ensure that her
23
        consent to the settlement is based on reason.
2.4
                  THE COURT: Okay. And then you said that you
25
       had used Ms. Adams before, so I assume she has some
```

professional capacity in which you would have used her 1 2 What is that? Is she an attorney? MR. PHILIP DAVIS: Well, Your Honor, there is 3 4 no professional qualifications for a personal 5 representative, but I've worked with Ms. Adams in a 6 couple other wrongful death cases, and I know that she 7 has been a personal representative appointed in about a dozen wrongful death cases. So she has what I would 8 9 call on-the-job experience, as well as having dealt with 10 a number of highly skilled and experienced plaintiffs' 11 lawyers in wrongful death cases that resulted in recoveries of substantial sums. 12 13 THE COURT: Okay. Anything else you want to 14 say, Mr. Davis? 15 MR. PHILIP DAVIS: None, Your Honor. 16 you. 17 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Chavez, do you 18 have anything that you would like to add to what 19 Mr. Davis has said? 20 MR. STEVEN CHAVEZ: Your Honor, just a little 21 -- a few seconds of history. The mother of the children 22 did consent to the personal representative to act as the 23 personal representative of this case, and so we went 2.4 through that with all the clients in this case.

there was consent there from the child, from the mother,

25

and from Mr. Jamin Bailon.

2.4

That's all I would like to add, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. And then, Ms. Martinez, why don't you talk about the issues, the relevant issues from your perspective. And if you want me to go over those again, I'm happy to. If you remember what they are, either restating them or -- because you are very experienced in this matter. Just please go ahead.

MS. JONLYN MARTINEZ: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.

First, I would like to thank the Davises and all counsel for their professionalism, because this was a difficult case. It involved a wrongful death and high emotions on both sides, and they were excellent to work with, so that made the resolution of this case much easier, even though it was a very difficult case.

Malott in February of 2020, and we were unable to resolve it at that time. But since that time, Mr. Davis was very helpful in continuing settlement discussions, and we continued settlement discussions up until we were able to reach a settlement. So those discussions, as he stated, those did continue for almost six months until we were able to finally reach a resolution in this case. So we did go back and forth for a long time, working on

2.4

a reasonable resolution of this case, and it did take almost six months. And this case did have to go before the Board of County Commissioners and executive session, where there was high debate about whether the settlement was appropriate. And ultimately, they approved the settlement.

There were contested issues of fact and law, as Mr. Davis stated. He did have his experts, I had my own experts, so it was going to be a battle of experts at trial, as well as my clients' testimony. So there was absolutely disputes of fact. And as he stated, my clients did contend that they were simply defending themselves when they discharged their firearms in this case.

So at the conclusion of discovery, I was going to move for summary judgment. And the case was going to be very expensive. The plaintiffs, I think, had five or six experts, I had several experts, so there were going to be many, many depositions that were going to be very costly in this case.

And I think -- I agree with counsel. I'm not sure what a jury would do with this case. You know, on the one hand, there was the death of an individual which is always horrible. But on the other hand, as Mr. Davis mentioned, we did have -- I think we had 400 recordings

2.4

of the decedent talking about various aspects of his activities from, you know, animal cruelty, pictures of his children, just a wide array of behaviors that would have reflected poorly on him and his care of his children.

And so at the end of the day, I think that -I do believe, Your Honor, the settlement was fair and
reasonable. I think Mr. Davis and Mr. Chavez negotiated
and obtained a fair settlement on behalf of their
clients, and I do believe it's fair and reasonable under
the circumstances, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. I think at this point maybe I'll ask you, Ms. Adams -- and I am going to place you under oath, if you don't mind.

Please raise your right hand. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give is true and correct to the best of your knowledge?

MS. ROMIE ADAMS: I do.

THE COURT: All right. So you heard

Mr. Davis -- and actually, could you please, while we
can see how your name is spelled, is it R-O-M-I-E Adams?

MS. ROMIE ADAMS: That's correct.

THE COURT: Okay. So could you just tell me about your background a little bit, and how it is you became personal representative of the wrongful death

estate in this case.

2.4

MS. ROMIE ADAMS: I'm retired. I've worked with many agencies throughout the state. I have three children and four grandchildren. I'm married. And I started working with attorneys — or actually, lawyers. My husband's cousin was an attorney, so we started working with him and have continued working as personal representatives for different lawyers that, you know, have asked us or have asked me to serve as a personal representative in their cases.

THE COURT: Okay. And how many cases have you been a personal representative in, about?

MS. ROMIE ADAMS: Oh, around -- right around maybe 12 or so.

THE COURT: Okay. And is there any difference in your relationship as a personal representative versus you're also next friend to A.B.? And, again, that's a role that I just am trying to understand, to see if it's any different from being the personal representative.

Or how is your role different as next friend?

MS. ROMIE ADAMS: There's really not a difference. I mean, when I serve as personal representative, I serve to the capacity that I am asked to serve it which is, you know, in the best interests of the minor child or children.

THE COURT: 1 Okay. 2 MS. ROMIE ADAMS: Of each individual case. 3 MR. PHILIP DAVIS: Your Honor, if I may? THE COURT: Sure. 4 MR. PHILIP DAVIS: Ms. Adams is personal 5 6 representative of the estate because the estate has the 7 wrongful death claim. She's next friend of A.B. because A.B., as a child, cannot bring her claim for loss of 8 9 consortium and needs somebody to do it for her, and 10 that's the next friend rule. 11 THE COURT: Okay. But I'm just wondering if 12 there's a possibility at all of like a conflict. 13 MR. PHILIP DAVIS: No, no conflict. 14 sorry. I didn't mean to interrupt, Your Honor. 15 THE COURT: That's okay. 16 MR. PHILIP DAVIS: There is no conflict 17 because in this case in particular, the loss of consortium claim that the children have is essentially 18 19 no different than their being beneficiaries of the 2.0 estate. And so the only recipients of either the estate 21 or the loss of consortium claims is the same two 22 children. 23 THE COURT: Okay. And then, Ms. Adam, I'm 2.4 going to ask you a few questions about the negotiations 25 in this case. When the settlement -- well, first, did

```
you participate in that first mediation with Judge
 1
 2
       Malott?
                  MS. ROMIE ADAMS: Yes, I did.
 3
                  THE COURT: Okay. And did also Jamin Bailon
 4
 5
       participate, Ms. Adams?
 6
                  MS. ROMIE ADAMS: Phil, did he participate?
 7
                  MR. PHILIP DAVIS: I don't remember if the
       younger Mr. Bailon was at the mediation. I think Steve
 8
 9
       was there in his behalf.
10
                  THE COURT: Okay. So, Ms. Adams, during that
11
       negotiation and in the negotiations that happened after
12
       that, were you consulted before Mr. Davis would take an
13
       offer to Ms. Martinez?
14
                  MS. ROMIE ADAMS: Mr. Davis was really good
15
        in informing me and keeping me up-to-date on all
16
       negotiations throughout the case.
17
                  THE COURT: Did you approve the ultimate
18
       demand of $125,000?
19
                  MS. ROMIE ADAMS: After speaking with
2.0
       Mr. Davis, we all decided that it was in the best
       interests of the minor child to agree on the settlement.
21
22
                  THE COURT: Okay. And when you say "we all,"
23
       who all was involved in that decision?
2.4
                  MS. ROMIE ADAMS: Well, Mr. Davis, Mr. Chavez,
25
       and myself. And I know he spoke with the family of Mr.
```

```
Bailon.
 1
 2
                  THE COURT: I'm sorry. I missed that.
 3
                  MS. ROMIE ADAMS: The family. Mr. Davis was
       in contact with the family of Mr. Bailon.
 4
                  THE COURT: Okay. And maybe I'll get back to
 5
 6
       that at the end. All right. How familiar -- are you
 7
       familiar with A.B.'s circumstances right now?
                  MS. ROMIE ADAMS: Yes, I am.
 8
 9
                  THE COURT: Okay. And how did you become
10
       familiar with her circumstances? Have you met her?
11
                 MS. ROMIE ADAMS: I haven't met her in person,
12
       but I have spoken to her over the phone.
13
                  THE COURT: About how many times?
14
                  MS. ROMIE ADAMS: I've only spoken to her
15
       once.
16
                  THE COURT: And you know Mr. Davis said that
17
       she's 17. When will she be 18?
                  MS. ROMIE ADAMS: In six months. She will
18
19
       turn 18 in February.
2.0
                  THE COURT: Did you talk to her about the
21
       settlement before you agreed to the settlement? Or no?
22
                 MS. ROMIE ADAMS: No.
23
                  THE COURT: Okay. As far as you know, is
2.4
       there any -- is it any problem with her, once she turns
25
       18, sort of living on her own? Does she have any
```

disabilities or any issues like that, that would make it 1 2 difficult for her to live on her own? MS. ROMIE ADAMS: I don't think so. 3 THE COURT: Okay. And given your role in the 4 5 case and your knowledge of the case, do you agree that 6 there were serious questions of law and fact which could 7 place the outcome of the litigation in doubt? MS. ROMIE ADAMS: Yes. 8 9 THE COURT: Do you also believe that the value 10 of an immediate recovery outweighs the possibility of 11 future relief after protracted and expensive litigation? 12 MS. ROMIE ADAMS: Yes. 13 THE COURT: Now, you heard Mr. Davis talk 14 about how the fees and I guess your own fees were 15 basically being -- how you were agreeing to take the 16 settlement funds and divide it among everybody. Do you 17 believe that those fees are -- well, first, let me start 18 with the attorneys' fees. They're each getting the same 19 amount that each minor child is getting -- or I'm sorry -- the amount that A.B. is getting, and then also the 20 21 other child who is not a minor child. 22 MS. ROMIE ADAMS: Yes. THE COURT: You heard that discussion? 23 MS. ROMIE ADAMS: Yes. 2.4 25 THE COURT: Do you believe that that is a fair

```
fee arrangement, given the circumstances?
 1
 2
                  MS. ROMIE ADAMS: Yes, I do.
 3
                  THE COURT: And why?
                  MS. ROMIE ADAMS: Because of the amount of the
 4
        settlement and because of the cost.
 5
 6
                  THE COURT: I'm sorry, Ms. Adams. We're
 7
       having a little bit of trouble, and I'm wondering if
 8
       maybe sometimes it's easier if you turn off your video,
 9
       then the audio comes through a little better. Do you
10
       mind trying that, turning off your video and then
11
       talking again?
12
                  MS. ROMIE ADAMS: Okay. Is that better?
13
                  THE COURT: So far.
14
                  MS. ROMIE ADAMS: Okay.
15
                  THE COURT: So go ahead and tell me why you
16
       think that fee is fair and reasonable.
17
                  MS. ROMIE ADAMS: Like I mentioned earlier, I
       think it's fair due to the facts and the circumstances
18
19
       of the case and the amount of the settlement.
2.0
       think it's fair on the amounts that everybody had to
21
        split after the experts were paid.
22
                  THE COURT: Okay. And it sounds like you're
23
       being paid out of the costs? Is that correct?
                  MS. ROMIE ADAMS: That is correct, uh-huh.
2.4
25
                  THE COURT: Okay. And that's only a portion,
```

```
I take it, of the -- was it about $50,000 that was being
 1
 2
        devoted to costs?
 3
                  MS. ROMIE ADAMS: That's correct.
                  THE COURT: Okay. And you're getting a
 4
 5
        portion of that $50,000?
 6
                  MS. ROMIE ADAMS: Yes. I'm getting $2500 out
 7
        of that, as personal representative.
 8
                  THE COURT: Okay. Do you have any sense --
 9
        well, actually, never mind. Forget that question.
10
                  Do you have any questions, Ms. Martinez, for
11
       Ms. Adams?
12
                  MS. JONLYN MARTINEZ: Yes, Your Honor. I had
13
       muted myself to try to make it quiet.
14
                  THE COURT:
                             Okay.
15
                  MS. JONLYN MARTINEZ: Ms. Adams, are you
16
        comfortable that the settlement proceeds, the payment of
17
        the settlement proceeds, is in the best interests of
       A.B.?
18
19
                  MS. ROMIE ADAMS: Yes, I am.
2.0
                  MS. JONLYN MARTINEZ: Okay. And you
        understand that to the extent the settlement proceeds
21
22
        are mismanaged by A.B. or they are lost by A.B., she
23
        can't bring any additional claims against the defendants
2.4
        in this case, correct?
25
                  MS. ROMIE ADAMS: That is correct.
```

1	MS. JONLYN MARTINEZ: Okay. And you
2	understand that you are releasing any and all claims
3	that may have been brought on behalf of A.B. in this
4	matter?
5	MS. ROMIE ADAMS: Yes.
6	MS. JONLYN MARTINEZ: Or the estate of
7	Mr. Bailon, correct?
8	MS. ROMIE ADAMS: That is correct.
9	MS. JONLYN MARTINEZ: You understand that
10	you're waiving the right to a jury trial?
11	MS. ROMIE ADAMS: That is correct.
12	MS. JONLYN MARTINEZ: You understand that the
13	defendants are not admitting any liability in this case?
14	MS. ROMIE ADAMS: That is correct.
15	MS. JONLYN MARTINEZ: You understand that from
16	the settlement proceeds, all costs, fees and expenses
17	must be paid, including any medical expenses related to
18	this claim?
19	MS. ROMIE ADAMS: That is correct.
20	MS. JONLYN MARTINEZ: And have you had an
21	opportunity to review the release in this case?
22	MS. ROMIE ADAMS: No, I haven't.
23	MS. JONLYN MARTINEZ: Okay. And do you agree
24	that if any other claims are filed against the
25	defendants by anyone related to the estate, that the

estate will indemnify the defendants for any claims that 1 2 were settled in these proceedings? 3 MS. ROMIE ADAMS: I'm not understanding that question. Phil, can you help me out with that one? 4 MR. PHILIP DAVIS: Yes, Your Honor. We are 5 waiting to send the release to Ms. Adams until 6 7 Mr. Bailon has signed off on it, so she hasn't seen it. 8 But Ms. Martinez's question is an accurate question, and 9 the answer is properly "Yes," that the estate has agreed 10 to indemnification as a condition of the settlement 11 release. 12 MS. JONLYN MARTINEZ: Thank you, Mr. Davis. 13 Ms. Adams, you understand that other than the 14 payment of the settlement proceeds, there has been no 15 other inducement or representations relied on by you 16 that were made by the defendants or anyone else, other 17 than the payment of the settlement proceeds, correct? MS. ROMIE ADAMS: That is correct. 18 19 MS. JONLYN MARTINEZ: And you are entering 20 into the settlement voluntarily? 21 MS. ROMIE ADAMS: Yes, I am. 22 MS. JONLYN MARTINEZ: And you understand that 23 if the Court enters an order approving the settlement, 2.4 that A.B.'s claims and the estate's claims will be 25 extinguished forever?

1	MS. ROMIE ADAMS: I understand that.
2	MS. JONLYN MARTINEZ: And that A.B. can't
3	change her mind, and that you can't?
4	MS. ROMIE ADAMS: I'm sorry?
5	MS. JONLYN MARTINEZ: I'm sorry. A.B. can't
6	change her mind, and you can't change your mind about
7	agreeing to the settlement?
8	MS. ROMIE ADAMS: That is correct. I agree.
9	MS. JONLYN MARTINEZ: And do you believe that
10	under the circumstances, the settlement is fair,
11	reasonable, and in the best interest of the estate and
12	A.B.?
13	MS. ROMIE ADAMS: I agree that it is fair and
14	reasonable on behalf of the minor child.
15	MS. JONLYN MARTINEZ: And are you the personal
16	representative in addition to the rest of the estate of
17	Mr. Bailon?
18	MS. ROMIE ADAMS: Yes.
19	MS. JONLYN MARTINEZ: Okay. And you agree
20	that it is fair and reasonable with regard to the entire
21	estate, correct?
22	MS. ROMIE ADAMS: Correct.
23	MS. JONLYN MARTINEZ: Okay. Those are all my
24	questions, Your Honor. Thank you.
25	THE COURT: Okay. I have a couple more

```
questions, Ms. Adams. I just wanted to make sure that
 1
 2
       you understood. Did you understand that you are not
 3
       required to settle this case, and you could take it to
       trial if you wanted to?
 4
                  MS. ROMIE ADAMS: I understand that.
 5
 6
                  THE COURT: And you understand that if you
 7
       went to trial, that it's possible that the outcome could
       have been different than what the settlement is? In
 8
 9
       other words, the estate, it's possible, could have
10
       gotten more or less than what you're settling for? Did
11
       you understand that?
12
                  MS. ROMIE ADAMS: I understood that, yes.
13
                  THE COURT: Did anybody threaten you or force
14
       you in any way to get you to settle these claims?
15
                  MS. ROMIE ADAMS: No, Your Honor.
16
                  THE COURT: Are you confident that you
17
       understand the terms of the settlement in this case?
                  MS. ROMIE ADAMS: I understand the terms of
18
19
       this settlement.
20
                  THE COURT: Okay. So given those additional
21
       questions that I had, Ms. Martinez, do you have anything
22
       further?
23
                  MS. JONLYN MARTINEZ: No, Your Honor, I do
2.4
       not. Thank you.
25
                  THE COURT: Mr. Davis, do you have anything,
```

```
any further questions?
 1
 2
                  MR. PHILIP DAVIS: No, Your Honor.
 3
                  THE COURT: I'm sorry?
                  MR. PHILIP DAVIS: No, Your Honor.
 4
 5
                  THE COURT: Okay. And Mr. Chavez, do you have
 6
       any questions for Ms. Adams?
 7
                  MR. STEVEN CHAVEZ: No, Your Honor.
                                                       Thank
 8
       you.
 9
                  THE COURT: There was one question I did want
10
       to ask you, Mr. Davis. Based on the information that we
11
       received from Ms. Adams, she said that you had been in
12
       touch with the family, as well, and I'm just wondering
13
       if you could tell me what their view was of the
14
        settlement, since they're not here to speak for
15
       themselves? I just would like to get an understanding
16
       of, I believe, the mother. You may have consulted with
17
       the mother. I don't know if you consulted with A.B., as
       well. But if you could just give me their view.
18
19
                  MR. PHILIP DAVIS: Yes, Your Honor. Ms. Adams
       actually misstated it. It was Mr. Chavez who has had
2.0
21
       the primary contact with the family, so I would ask that
22
       he respond to your question.
23
                  THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Chavez?
2.4
                  MR. STEVEN CHAVEZ: Thank you, Your Honor.
25
       Yes, Your Honor, I've been in very close contact with
```

2.4

this family. They live in the same county that I live in. I've met with them in person in my office at least six times throughout this litigation, and I've talked with them on the phone at least once a month, sometimes more often. During settlement negotiations, I was talking to them very often, probably at least a dozen times during all the negotiations.

There has been -- as Ms. Martinez stated and Mr. Davis stated, we've had ongoing negotiations for quite some time, and so that forced us to certainly speak with the mother and Mr. Bailon, Jamin Bailon. He is 21 years old. He works full-time and he works a lot. So we asked him if he wanted to be part of this hearing. We asked Ms. Martinez if it was necessary that he be at this hearing. And Mr. Bailon couldn't make it to this hearing, and Ms. Martinez said it wasn't necessary.

But, yes, I did speak with them as recently as yesterday regarding today's hearing. Actually, I spoke with the mother, Naomi, this morning regarding the hearing and regarding the release. So Mr. Bailon has reviewed the release. They intend to drop it off to me in the next day or two, to my office. And so they have approved it and they do consent with the settlement.

You know, what is interesting is when I spoke to A.B. -- I was speaking with A.B. and with Ms. Adams

2.4

this weekend, and one of the things she said is she agreed with the settlement, but that nothing -- no amount of money will ever bring back her father, so she really wasn't interested in the money in the first place; she was interested in what she believed was justice for the case. And then the elderly or the older Bailon, he was certainly consenting to the settlement, as well.

Thank you. Hopefully that answers your question.

THE COURT: Yes. And since you do have the relationship, maybe you could make sure, is there any --well, my understanding, and this actually comes from the earlier conference that we had, and it wasn't on the record, so we might as well put it on the record. My understanding is that there's a small amount of money that you intend to use from this settlement, or A.B. intends to use from the settlement, kind of right off the bat to purchase a car so that she can continue her education, but then the rest of the funds will be put in some sort of CD.

Could you tell me the more precise arrangements for that and when she would have access to the CD?

MR. STEVEN CHAVEZ: Yes, Your Honor. So what

2.0

2.4

was agreed to is essentially, she's going to get \$7500 so she can purchase a used car to go to the Valencia County UNM branch. She needs a car. She lives far away from anything, actually. It's a very rural area of the county. The rest of it will be placed in a three-year CD in her name, and she'll access it after three years. It will be in her name.

I'll set that up. I've done it before with numerous clients when there's not a lot of money. And if you'd like, I could have the personal representative do that, but it's probably easier if I do that. But I will provide the personal representative documentation that it has been set up, so that we can verify that it has been set up. And that's essentially it, Your Honor. We tried to structure the money through Kelly Ramsdell. The structure was not -- it didn't have a positive outcome because it was such a small amount of money. Interest rates are so low, and actually it would cost more money, I believe, than it was worth putting it into a structure. The payment value was literally like \$100, \$150, after several years.

So, yes, we agreed on the CD. We would ask the Court to approve that. And, again, I will provide the personal representative a verification that it has been done.

2.0

2.4

THE COURT: Okay. And then just also to double-check, I want to make sure that there is no issue with respect to any physical or mental disabilities with the child?

MR. STEVEN CHAVEZ: No issues, Your Honor.

That's a very good question. There are no issues with disability, incapacity at all, with the child, the mother, or Mr. Jamin Bailon.

should also put on the record, because I want to just make sure it's clear, that the parties have asked me to conduct this fairness hearing without having a GAL, a guardian ad litem, because of the small amount of the settlement and nobody wanted to divert funds from the children to go towards the settlement. So Mr. Davis, Mr. Chavez, whoever wants to speak, I just want sort of like confirmation, more to just put on the record why it is that you've asked to do this without a GAL.

MR. PHILIP DAVIS: Your Honor, it's partly for what you said, because it's more money, and Mr. Chavez's solution made sense to all of us. And the other is that because A.B. is 17, we're only a few months away from the age of majority. It did not seem like a useful expenditure of resources to hire a GAL, when we had an experienced personal representative and experienced

2.0

2.4

counsel on both sides to be able to present the matter to you.

THE COURT: All right. Ms. Martinez, do you have anything you'd like to add to that?

MS. JONLYN MARTINEZ: No, Your Honor. I think I felt comfortable simply because it was Mr. Davis and Mr. Chavez. They are very experienced lawyers, and I trust their judgment. And if they believe it's fair and reasonable, I think that their judgment speaks for itself.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Chavez, anything further that you would like to add?

MR. STEVEN CHAVEZ: No, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Well, it is my intent at this point, I will find that the settlement is fair and reasonable and in the best interests of the minor child, A.B. I will approve the settlement. I will also prepare an order that I would expect to have out by next week. I'd like to say by the middle of next week, maybe by the end of next week, but it will be next week. So we'll just do our very best to get it out by next week, assuming no other thing comes up.

Does that work for everybody's schedule? Do you have any problem with that, Mr. Chavez or Mr. Davis?

```
MR. PHILIP DAVIS: No, Your Honor.
 1
 2
                  MR. STEVEN CHAVEZ: No, Your Honor.
 3
                  THE COURT: Ms. Martinez, is that all right
       with you?
 4
 5
                  MS. JONLYN MARTINEZ: Yes. Thank you, Your
 6
       Honor.
 7
                  THE COURT: All right. Anything else that
       anybody would like to say with regard to this fairness
 8
 9
       hearing? And, again, I just want to make sure everybody
10
       gets on the record anything they want on the record.
11
                  Mr. Davis, anything further?
                  MR. PHILIP DAVIS: Nothing further, Your
12
13
       Honor.
                  THE COURT: Mr. Chavez?
14
15
                  MR. STEVEN CHAVEZ: Only just to thank you,
16
       Your Honor, for letting us have this hearing so quickly.
17
       Thank you. Nothing else.
18
                  THE COURT: And Ms. Martinez, anything?
19
                  MS. JONLYN MARTINEZ: No. Thank you very
2.0
       much, Your Honor.
21
                  THE COURT: All right. Well, thank you all
22
       very much for participating in this hearing. We'll get
23
       our order done as quickly as possible. And I appreciate
2.4
       your attendance. Thanks very much.
25
                  MS. JONLYN MARTINEZ: Thank you.
```

```
1
                   MS. RONNIE ADAMS: Thank you.
 2
                   THE COURT:
                               'Bye 'bye.
 3
                   MR. PHILIP DAVIS: Goodbye.
 4
                   (Proceedings concluded at 2:47 p.m.)
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

JULIE GOEHL, RDR, CRR, RPR, RMR, NM CCR #95
FEDERAL OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER
333 Lomas Boulevard, Northwest
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA 1 2 DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO 3 CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL REPORTER 4 I, Julie Goehl, RDR, CRR, RPR, RMR, 5 6 New Mexico CCR #95, Federal Official Realtime Court 7 Reporter, in and for the United States District Court 8 for the District of New Mexico, do hereby certify that pursuant to Section 753, Title 28, United States Code, 9 10 that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of 11 the stenographically reported proceedings held in the 12 above-entitled matter and that the transcript page 13 format is in conformance with the regulations of the Judicial Conference of the United States. 14 15 Dated this 4th day of September, 2020. 16 17 JULIE GOEHL 18 FEDERAL OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER Registered Diplomate Reporter 19 Registered Professional Reporter Registered Merit Reporter 20 Certified Realtime Reporter NM Certified Court Reporter #95 21 333 Lomas Boulevard, Northwest Albuquerque, New Mexico 22 Phone: (505)348-2209Email: Julie_Goehl@nmd.uscourts.gov 23 2.4 25